

Remarks/Arguments:

Examiner Tugbang is thanked for examination of the present Patent Application. Applicant has made changes in the Claims to better point up the invention over the references. The Claims are now believed to be allowable and it is so requested.

1. Reconsideration of the objection to Claims 1 and 7 because of formalities is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to Claims and for the reasons hereafter given.

Claim 1 is cancelled and the rejection is moot.

Claim 7 is amended to include the phrase "the tool" in line (c).

2. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 1 through 5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by **Jeong 6,183,439** is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to Claims and for the reasons hereafter given.

Claims 1 through 5 are cancelled and the rejection is moot.

3. Reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Jeong** in view of **Schmitz 5,235,482** is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and for the reasons hereafter given.

Claim 6 is canceled and the rejection is moot.

4. Applicant accepts the Examiners suggestion of re-writing Claim 7 in independent form including all of the limitations of the rejected base claim and the intervening claims. Claim 8 is necessarily part of the method and is therefore also included in the amended claim.
5. Applicant believes that the mounting tool used in the amended method claim 7 is a vital component of the invention and that the structure of this tool should also be claimed in the newly added claims 17-20. The tool and its operation are significantly different than the corresponding tool described by Jeong '439.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

George O. Saile & Associates

By 

Stephen B. Ackerman
Reg. No. 37,761
Tel. (845) 452-5863